

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 13-15 and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated over U.S. Patent No. 6,349,018 to Koishi et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows. With respect to amended claims 1 and 13, Applicant traverses because the cited reference does not disclose (or even suggest) top surfaces of a head portion and a dummy head portion being formed lower by a step with respect to the head slider main body than top surfaces of the air bearing portions. Similarly, with respect to claim 21, Applicant traverses because the cited reference does not disclose (or even suggest) a top surface of the head portion being formed lower by a step with respect to the head slider main body than a top surface of the air bearing portions.

Further, with respect to claims 1 and 13, the reference does not disclose (or even suggest) a first protection film and a second protection film provided adjacent an air outflow end of the air bearing portions. Further still, with respect to claims 1 and 13, Applicant traverses because the reference does not disclose (or even suggest) a protection film disposed on one of the air bearing portions, wherein the first and second protection film portions are orthogonal to the protection film disposed on one of the air bearing portions. Moreover, with respect to claims 1 and 13, the reference does not disclose (or even suggest) a third protection film portion formed at said air outflow end adjacent to the first and second protection film portions.

With respect to amended claims 1 and 13, Applicant traverses because Koishi does not disclose (or even suggest) top surfaces of a head portion and a dummy head portion being formed lower by a step with respect to the head slider main body than top surfaces of the air bearing portions. Koishi discloses a negative pressure air bearing slider including a pair of air bearing surfaces formed on the bottom of the slider body separately from the first air bearing surface at downstream positions. As shown in FIGS. 2 and 8B of Koishi, the head portion 28 is embedded in the slider body at one of the air bearing surfaces 25a, 25b. The top surface of the head portion 28/dummy portion is level with a first top surface 25b of the air bearing surface. Further, the head portion 28/dummy portion does not form a step lower with respect to the head slider main body than top surfaces of the air bearing portions 25a, 25b.

Claims 1 and 13 of the present invention, on the other hand, recite that the top surfaces of the head and dummy head portions form a step lower, with respect to the head slider main body, than the top surfaces of the air bearing portions. In other words, claims 1 and 13 feature that the head/dummy head portions are a step lower than the air bearing portions. Comparing the geometry of Koishi in FIGS. 2 and 8B, in particular, the head slider main body 23, the head slider air bearing portion 25b, and the head portion (embedded in 35b), with the geometry of the present invention, in particular the head slider main body, the head portion 4, and the air bearing portion 32 (for example, in FIG. 5B), it is clear that Koishi fails to show or suggest any such step configuration as recited in claims 1 and 13. Koishi fails to disclose or suggest the step down geometry from the top surface of the air bearing

portion to the top surface of the head portion because Koishi merely discloses a head portion 28 embedded in a top surface 25b of the air bearing portion.

Further, in Paper No. 4, the Examiner asserts that Koishi discloses “top surfaces of the head portion and dummy head portion (Col 10, lines 23-30; by 27b, 27c) being formed lower by a step with respect to the main slider head body than top surface (25a, 25b) of the air bearing portions.” However, the Examiner is incorrect in this assertion because steps 27b and 27c are steps between a lower surface and an upper surface of the air bearing portion; not between a top surface of a head portion and a top surface of an air bearing portion.

With respect to claim 21, Applicant traverses for similar reasons as argued with respect to claims 1 and 13 above, because the cited reference does not disclose (or even suggest) a top surface of the head portion being formed lower by a step with respect to the head slider main body than a top surface of the air bearing portions. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the Section 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 13 and 21, and the claims that depend therefrom, should be withdrawn.

Applicant further traverses the rejection of claims 1 and 13, which recite a first film and a second film provided adjacent an air outflow end of the air bearing portions. Koishi merely discloses a first film 43 located at an air outflow end of the air bearing portion (FIG. 7E). Accordingly, the Section 102 rejection of claims 1 and 13 is traversed, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.


Further still, with respect to claims 1 and 13, Applicant traverses because the reference does not disclose (or even suggest) a protection film disposed on one of the air bearing portions, wherein the first and second protection film portions are orthogonal to the protection film disposed on one of the air bearing portions, as currently amended. Referring to FIG. 3B, the present invention includes a protection film 34A disposed on one of the air bearing portions 32, and the first and second film portions 26, 27 are orthogonal to the protection film. Koishi does not disclose this structure.

Moreover, Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1 and 13, which have been amended to recite “a third protection film portion formed at said air outflow end” adjacent to said first and second protection films. As asserted by the Examiner, Koishi discloses a first and a second film (DLC layer 43), and a third film 45 (FIG. 8). However, the third film 45 is not located adjacent the first and second protection films 43, but is separated by the adhesive layer 44 to a first film 43, and by a gap to a second film 43 (see FIG. 7A-7F).. Accordingly, the Section 102 rejection of amended claims 1 and 13 is traversed, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this Application, including claims 1-3, 6-8, 13-15, and 18-21, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Laura R. Wanek
Registration No. 53,737

Customer No. 24978

September 7, 2004

300 South Wacker Drive - Suite 2500

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: (312) 360-0080

Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

P:\DOCS\2803\65313\575831.DOC